The Objective Existence Method and the Existence of Design Processes: Disproving "Natural" and Implying a Creator

Abstract

This thesis investigates whether "natural" processes (undesigned, self-originating phenomena) exist distinctly from design processes (manual or automatic, consciously initiated) using the Objective Existence Method (OEM), an evidence-based logic and reason quality assurance program. Through rigorous application of OEM's syllogistic framework—abduction to identify objective reality, deduction for certainty, and induction for probability—we conclude that only design processes are evidenced in objective reality, while "natural" processes lack demonstrable existence. This finding challenges the presupposition of "natural" as a valid category and implies the necessity of a Creator to account for the initiation of observed processes, with significant implications for worldview, morals, and politics.

Introduction

The distinction between "natural" and "designed" processes underpins many worldviews, yet these terms are often assumed rather than proven. The Objective Existence Method (OEM) offers a metaphysics to test such assumptions, defining evidence as objective existence (sensory, mind-independent phenomena) and using logic and reason (abduction, deduction, induction) to establish truth. OEM posits that observation and logic form logos—truth-based worldview—while imagination unchecked by logic breeds anti-logos, leading to false morals and oppressive politics. Our inquiry began with "natural" (e.g., volcanic eruptions, tree growth) versus "design" (e.g., bird nests, factories), culminating in a refined question: Can "natural" processes be evidenced, or are all processes designed, implying a Creator?

Methodology: The Objective Existence Method (OEM)

OEM fuses two foundations:

Evidence: Objective existence—anything demonstrable through physical senses, independent of the mind. Existence is proof; absence is not evidence.

Logic and Reason:

Abduction: Establishes what exists (B – A = A), eliminating non-existent phenomena.

Deduction: Draws certain conclusions from evidenced premises (A + B = C).

Induction: Infers probabilities when multiple categories exist (p(A / B) = A / B).

Rules:

Only abduced, objectively existing phenomena are premises.

Objective existences cannot contradict; they disprove beliefs.

Non-existent phenomena cannot be premises.

Three authorities of truth—Objective Existence (real), Wordism (mind-dependent), Totemism (consensus-based)—are tested, with only the first valid.

Syllogism ensures transparency, preventing fallacies or bias.

OEM determines whether abduction yields one category (deduction) or multiple (induction), rejecting presuppositions like "natural" unless evidenced.

Analysis: Testing "Natural" vs. "Design" Processes

Initial Abduction: Seeking Evidence

We began by testing "natural" (undesigned processes) against "design" (consciously initiated).

Premise 1: Evidence exists of manual design processes—ongoing conscious intervention.

Observation: A bird weaves a nest (sight: twigs shaped); a human assembles a tool (sight: hands crafting). Cessation stops the process.

Premise 2: Evidence exists of automatic design processes—agent-initiated, self-running.

Observation: A wind-up toy moves after human winding (sight: key turned); a car factory produces cars post-setup (sight: machines operating). Destruction halts production unless restarted.

Premise 3: Evidence for "natural" processes—self-originating, undesigned—is sought.

Observation: Volcanoes erupt (sight: lava forming obsidian, Ref 1); trees grow (sight: seeds sprouting). Both operate without ongoing intervention, but their systems (Earth, seeds) pre-exist observation. Destroying all trees/seeds or Earth's core stops production—no spontaneous re-emergence is seen.

Challenge: Post-observation (volcanoes, trees) can't confirm "natural" origins—automatic design (e.g., Earth as a "foundry") fits equally. Lack of an agent isn't evidence of no agent.

Refined Abduction: Origin Evidence

Premise 1: Manual design is observed—agent action is direct (nests).

Premise 2: Automatic design is observed—agent initiation is inferable (factories, toys show complexity: gears, wiring).

Premise 3: No process is observed originating without a prior system or agent.

Evidence: Volcanoes depend on Earth (core heat); trees on seeds (DNA). No sensory data shows Earth or seeds forming from nothing—destruction (e.g., no seeds) ends production without restart.

Conclusion: Only design processes (manual/automatic) are abduced; "natural" lacks evidence.

(B – A = A: Subtracting unproven "natural" leaves design.)

Deductive Verification

Premise 1: All abduced processes are design (manual/automatic).

Premise 2: Volcanic eruptions and tree growth are observed processes.

Conclusion: Volcanic eruptions and tree growth are design processes.

(A + B = C: All are design + specific cases = specific design.)

Reasoning Type: Only design is evidenced—no "natural" category exists for induction. Deduction applies.

Results: "Natural" Disproven, Design Affirmed

"Natural" Fails: No process is observed self-originating without a system (e.g., Earth, seeds). Assuming "natural" from absence of an agent is Wordism—OEM rejects it. Post-observation can't distinguish "natural" from automatic design, and destruction tests (no trees post-seeds) suggest reliance on a setup.

Design Prevails: Manual (nests) and automatic (factories, trees via seeds) processes are evidenced. Complexity (Earth's core, seed DNA) parallels designed systems, implying initiation.

OEM Outcome: "Natural" isn't a premise—only design processes are abduced as objective existence.

Implications: Inferring a Creator

Deductive Inference

Premise 1: All observed processes are design (manual/automatic), requiring a conscious agent to initiate.

Premise 2: Earth's processes (volcanoes) and life's processes (trees) are observed, yet no human or earthly agent initiates their systems (core, first seeds).

Conclusion: A non-human conscious agent—a Creator—must have initiated these processes.

(A + B = C: Design needs an agent + no earthly agent = external agent.)

Analysis

Evidence Gap: No direct observation of a Creator exists (sight: no entity seen forming Earth). OEM limits premises to sensory data, but abduction excludes earthly agents, leaving an external initiator as a logical necessity.

Automatic Design: Earth as a "foundry" or seeds as "factories" fits—self-running but not self-starting. Destroying the system (no seeds, no Earth) halts production, unlike a "natural" re-emergence.

Creator's Role: A conscious agent designing Earth's core or first seeds aligns with observed complexity (e.g., DNA's precision), though unobservable now.

Worldview Implications

Logos: If all processes are designed, logos (observation + logic) points to a purposeful reality, supporting a Creator-based worldview. Morals (order, responsibility) and politics (authority, justice) may reflect this design's intent.

Anti-Logos Threat: Presuming "natural" without evidence fosters anti-logos—randomness or chaos as false premises, leading to nihilistic morals and oppressive politics (e.g., control via untruth).

OEM's Defense: By disproving "natural," OEM guards against such falsehoods, aligning knowledge with objective reality.

Conclusion

Using OEM, we abduced that only design processes—manual (e.g., nests) and automatic (e.g., factories, volcanoes)—exist in objective reality. "Natural" processes lack evidence, as post-observation can't distinguish them from automatic design, and destruction tests suggest reliance on initiated systems. This excludes "natural" as a premise, affirming design as the sole category. Deductively, a Creator is implied: no earthly agent accounts for Earth's or life's initial systems, necessitating an external conscious initiator. This shifts worldview from chance to purpose, reinforcing logos against anti-logos, with OEM as the tool to ensure truth. Future inquiry could seek direct Creator evidence, but within current data, design—and thus a Creator—prevails.